

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants have studied the office action mailed August 9, 2007, and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 40, 44-50, 51, and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostak (5893125) in view of Rao (6085202). Claims 31, 41, and 53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostak (5893125) and Rao (6085202) as applied to claims 30, 40, 50, 51, and 52 above, and further in view of MandrakeSoft (Copyright 2003). Claim 42 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostak (5893125), Rao (6085202) and MandrakeSoft (Copyright 2003) as applied to claim 41 above, and further in view of Luque (200410119749 A1). Claims 32-39, 43, 54, and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shostak (5893125), and Rao (6085202) as applied to claims 30, 40, 50, 51, and 52 above, and further in view of Luque (200410119749 A1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

For example, claim 51 is directed to a “method for controlling how data is presented in a tabular display, comprising: presenting to a user a display having a view configuration widget providing a graphical interface object having a plurality of selectable elements representing preconfigured filters for filtering columns and rows of a table for display according to predetermined criteria; accepting user input to select a selectable element to implement a filter associated with the selectable element selected by the user to display a preset configuration of rows and columns; and presenting a display of the preset configuration of rows and columns to the user.

The Examiner has conceded that the Shostak reference does not “explicitly disclose presenting to a user a display having a view configuration widget providing a graphical interface object having a plurality of selectable elements representing preconfigured filters for filtering columns and rows of a table for display according to predetermined criteria.” Indeed, the Examiner’s citations to the Shostak reference appear to describe an “annotation bubble” which permits a user to enter a dialog to enter criteria for filtering a particular column to which the annotation bubble is dragged. Thus, it is clear that the annotation bubble of the Shostak reference cited by the Examiner does not have “a plurality of selectable elements representing

preconfigured filters for filtering columns and rows of a table for display according to predetermined criteria” as required by claim 51.

It is the Examiner’s position that the Rao reference “discloses a method for producing a table image having focus and context regions and further discloses a system that allows the user to select the reordering of columns and rows (abstract; Column 6, Lines 14-20).” Thus, even if the Examiner’s position were true, a point not conceded herein, it is clear that the deficiencies of the Shostak reference are not met by the Examiner’s citations to the Rao reference.

The Examiner has simply cited no portion of the Rao reference which describes filtering columns or rows of a table. Even with respect to the cited “table image having focus and context regions” or the cited “reordering of columns and rows,” neither of which are related to filtering, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has cited no portion of the Rao reference which indicates how the user would select a focus region or reorder columns and rows. Instead, it appears that in the Rao reference, an “input signal” is used to select a cell for a focal region. Rao, col. 22, lines 20 et seq. Thus, even if the Shostak and Rao references were combined, the suitability of which is not conceded, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill would merely use an “input signal” as described in the Rao reference to define criteria for filtering a column as described by the Shostak reference. It is clear that such a combination does not in any manner teach or suggest “a plurality of selectable elements representing preconfigured filters for filtering columns and rows of a table for display according to predetermined criteria” as required by claim 51.

The deficiencies of the Shostak and Rao references are not met by the Examiner’s citations to the MandrakeSoft and Luque references. Independent claims 30, 40, 50 and 52 may be distinguished in a similar fashion.

The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the anticipation or obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner’s comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 9, 2007

By: /William Konrad/

William K. Konrad
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

William K. Konrad
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7970
Fax: 310-556-7984